DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 675 CS 201 577

AUTHOR Grunig, James E.
TITLE A Case Study of Organizational Information Seeking and Consumer Information Needs.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (57th, San Diego, California, August 18-21, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Case Studies; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Conceptual Schemes; *Consumer Education; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Journalism; *Organizational Communication; Organizations (Groups); *Public Relations

ABSTRACT

The results of a case study of organizational information seeking conducted by the Seminar in Corporate Communication in the University of Maryland College of Journalism are reported in this paper. The purpose of the seminar is to give students practical experience in public relations research. The case study involved the consumer information program of Giant Food, Inc., a major Washington-Baltimore food and general merchandise retailer. The paper develops a theory, derived from a decision-situation model, network analysis, and a coorientation model, which will guide information seeking efforts of public relations practitioners. It then uses these theoretical concepts and the methodology of Q factor analysis to develop typologies of consumers. The paper concludes that the concepts and methods utilized in the study represent a useful model for other public relations research efforts. (Author/RB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 097675

A CASE STUDY OF ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION SEEKING AND CONSUMER INFORMATION NEEDS

James E. Grunig

College of Journalism
University of Maryland

Paper presented to the Public Relations Division, Association for Education in Journalism, San Diego, Calif., Aug. 18-21, 1974

CS 201 577

Authors of the two leading textbooks on public relations both claim, in differing words, that the most important activity of a public relations practitioner is that of promoting effective information seeking by the organization which employs him. Cutlip and Center conclude that "A sure, sensitive reading of the changing environment can be the practitioner's most valuable service to his organization."[1] Robinson likewise states that a public relations practitioner should base his decisions on the "best available evidence" and therefore "one should think of the public relations practitioner as an applied social and behavioral scientist."[2]

The work of a scientist can generally be distinguished from that of a non-scientist by two characteristics: 1) his use of theory and 2) his use of systematic data-gathering techniques (research methodologies). If public relations practitioners are indeed applied social scientists, they should make use of social science theories and methods.

Research shows, however, that few practitioners actually use communication procedures through which their organizations can seek information from publics.[3]

For these reasons, the University of Maryland's Seminar in Corporate Communication is designed to give graduate students in the College of Journalism practical experience in using communication theory and research methods to facilitate

information seeking by an actual organization. The seminar has three purposes: To review communication and organizational theory relevant to corporate communication, 2) to examine research methods that could be used by professional communications practitioners, and 3) to counsel with professionals in an actual corporation and apply the theory and methods developed in the course to the actual communication problems of that corporation.

In 1972, the seminar studied the employee communication program of the Potomac Electric Power Co. of Washington, D. C.[4] This paper reports the results of the Fall 1973 seminar which conducted an external communication study of the consumer information program of the Giant Food Co., a major food and general merchandise retailer in the Washington-Baltimore area. Giant is recognized as a leader in consumer information programs, having instituted such programs as unit pricing, open dating, percentage labeling, and toy safety information. To develop and carry out these programs, Giant hired Esther Peterson, former consumer affairs adviser to President Lyndon Johnson, as its consumer adviser.

Giant had conducted some surveys of customers in its food stores to determine their interest in its consumer programs. But Giant had never done a systematic study of the information needs of its food customers and knew very little about the information needs of its general merchandise customers.

Thus the seminar provided both a valuable field experience for graduate students in public relations and provided Giant with important information about its customers' information needs.

Students in the seminar spent about a third of the semester reviewing relevant theoretical literature. Then the class met with representatives of Giant's communications and consumer affairs departments to discuss plans, programs and problems. After this meeting, the students wrote a detailed paper reviewing and interpreting the theoretical literature and isolating concepts which could be applied to an analysis of Giant and its external publics. The rest of the semester was devoted to making final decisions on relevant concepts, preparing a questionnaire, drawing a sample, interviewing consumers, and analyzing the results.

This paper reviews the concepts and methods employed, interprets the results of the study, and then draws implications for Giant's consumer information program and for corporate communication in general.

Concepts

The basic theoretical framework for the study was a decision-situation model developed by Grunig which predicts when individuals will seek information and the kinds of information they will seek.[5] It is particularly useful in

public relations because it defines the kinds of people which will be in an organization's publics--i.e., individuals could not be considered to be in an organization's public unless they are motivated to seek information from that organization. To seek information means basically that an individual will stop to receive or attend to a message.

Briefly stated, the model predicts that individuals will seek information when they perceive a problem. To have a problem means simply that an individual recognizes that it is important to make a choice between alternative products, stores, jobs, ways of performing daily tasks, etc. Individuals seek information only when they perceive a problem in this sense and they pay attention only to messages and media which provide information relevant to their "problem orientation." Problem orientation can be determined by the attributes which an individual considers most important in distinguishing between relevant alternatives.[6] For example, one consumer may choose a food store which has the attribute of convenience to his home, another might look for the store which has the lowest prices.

Secondly, the model predicts that individuals will seek information only about alternatives which are available within their situation or environment. A consumer, for example, would not buy a product which he could not afford, nor buy

from a store which he cannot reach because of lack of transportation. When some alternatives are constrained, any information is irrelevant to the individual, and he will not seek it.

This model is particularly useful as an aid to corporate information seeking because it allows researchers to examine the life situation of individuals in the organization's publics and to determine information needs which those publics themselves might not have recognized. For a program designed specifically to provide information to meet consumer needs--such as Giant's--the model offers concepts which can evaluate the adequacy of current information programs which can define needs which the corporation might not have recognized.

Since the model consists of two dimensions--problem recognition and existence of constraints in the situation--it can be expressed in terms of four types of decision situations. In the following diagram, problem recognition is expressed as the individual being either open or closed. Existence of constaints is expressed as the situation being open or closed.

Individual \ Situation	Open	Closed
Open	Problem Solving	Constrained Decision
Closed	Routine Habit	Fatalism

In this two-way typology, problem solvers are those who both recognize a problem and have an open situation. Individuals who engage in routine habit have alternatives (an open situation) but do not recognize the importance of choosing between these alternatives and thus continue to behave in the same way time after time. If individuals face constaints and recognize a problem, they are said to be in constrained decision. If they face constraints and do not recognize a problem, they are called fatalists.

Only problem solvers generally seek information; they seek any information relative to their problem orientation (important discriminating attributes). Those in routine habit seek only information which reinforces their habit. In constrained decision, information is sought only about means of removing the constaints. Fatalists see little need for information and thus do not seek it.

These concepts were employed in a number of ways to determine the information needs of Giant customers. First, to determine problem recognition for food stores, we asked respondents how many stores they had considered when they made a choice about which stores to patronize. To determine constaints, we asked an open-ended question about why a particular store or stores had been chosen and then coded the response to indicate when a constraint was mentioned. The concepts

were utilized in a similar fashion to determine how consumers make decisions about individual food products within a store. The concept of problem orientation was used to determine the attributes consumers look for in a food store, the attributes of Giant general merchandise stores and catalog showcase centers that caused them to shop or not to shop there, and the attributes they look for in four representative general merchandise products.

These concepts, then, would reveal which kinds of people are problem solvers with regard to food and general merchandise decisions and which problem orientations would define their information needs.

To relate these concepts to consumer communication behavior, we relied primarily on the notion of network analysis.[7] In network analysis, the researcher takes an item of information and traces its path through an organization or some other type of social system by asking each respondent if he had heard the information and from whom or from what medium he had heard it. With this type of analysis, it is possible to determine which people have been exposed to different types of information and the sources from which they received this information. We adapted network analysis so that it would apply to the relationship of an organization to its external customer public. Thus, we asked consumers where they had first

heard about Giant, where they had heard about five consumer information programs in progress at Giant, where they had heard about a toy safety information guide released by Giant a week before the survey was conducted, and whether they gave information about Giant programs to friends and neighbors.

Thirdly, we used several concepts patterned after the concept of coorientation as used in recent communication research.[8] In coorientation research, people basically are asked what they think another person with whom they have or could have communicated are thinking. When these responses are compared with the other person's thought processes, it is possible to determine communication problems. In this study we asked consumers what they thought Giant's motivation was for sponsoring its consumer programs, whether they thought Giant was more concerned about consumers than other food chains, and whether they thought Giant was aware of consumer opinions.

Methods

Most standard survey research methods result in a distribution of responses to a series of variables or questionnaire items. At times, these variables are related to one another by correlations or other measures of association. These methods (generally called cross-sectional techniques) have one fault when they are used for applied communication research.

They cannot reveal types of sub-audiences or publics within the overall audience. Nor can they reveal the most important difference between these audience types. Cross-sectional methods can only show the distribution of the entire sample around one or a small number of variables.

An alternative method--case grouping--seems perfectly adapted for applied communication research. In case grouping, the researcher puts each respondent into one of a limited number of respondent types based on their similarity on all concepts measured. Then concepts can be compared within and across types to determine the importance of the concept in defining the type and in distinguishing it from other types. In the case of consumers the results would show the kinds of consumers the communicator must deal with and how these types differ from one another on all the variables.

Case grouping analysis can be accomplished rapidly through the use of a statistical technique called Q-factor analysis.[9] The specific procedure is as follows:

1. A number of variables are measured for each person in the sample and converted to standardized Z-scores. Z-scores are simply a person's score on a variable minus the mean for that variable divided by the standard deviation. Z-scores range from -3 to +3 with 0 as the mean. Z-scores are necessary because all the variables in a field study generally are not

on the same scale, yet they must be on a standard scale to make correlation and grouping of people possible.

2. A matrix is developed and each person is correlated with every other person in the sample using the standardized scores for all the variables. The step is the reverse of standard correlation techniques in which two variables are correlated on the basis of a sample of people; here two people are correlated on the basis of a sample of variables.

3. This matrix of correlations is submitted to factor analysis in order to abstract underlying factors--that is, factor analysis places each person into one or more groups on the basis of his intercorrelation with other people. The factor represents a grouping of people around a common set of attributes--a type of person. The factor loading (between 0 and 1.0) of each person indicates how strongly he represents or is typical of the group.

4. The importance of each variable in describing the type of person is determined by computing factor scores for each variable on each factor. This computation is made by weighting the variable score of each individual in a factor by his loading on the factor and summing the result for all individuals in the factor. The factor scores are then standardized into Z-scores to allow comparison across factors.

5. Comparison of the Z-scores for all variables on one

factor indicates which variables are most important in defining the type of person. Comparison of the Z-scores for each variable across factors indicates their relative importance in distinguishing one type of person from another.

Q-analysis is more interested in defining types of people--or publics--than in knowing the exact distribution of types of people within an overall population. Thus, the sample generally is chosen purposively rather than randomly. A purposive sample allows measurement of the range of people within a population without wasting time and money to repeatedly measure the average or modal type of person (which generally makes up about two-thirds of any population).

In this study, choosing a purposive sample was somewhat difficult because we had little prior knowledge as to how consumers would break down into types. Our only prediction was that education, income, and socio-economic status would make a difference. Thus, the sample chosen was basically a stratified random sample chosen from the phonebook for the Maryland suburbs of Washington, D. C. These suburbs contain people of a variety of educational and economic backgrounds, and most Giant stores are located in the suburbs. To insure that some low-income respondents would be included, names were chosen from the phonebook with addresses known to be in lower-income neighborhoods, and a fourth of the sample was taken from Anne Arundel county, a suburban area between

Baltimore and Annapolis which was expected to contain more blue-collar workers than could be found in the Washington metropolitan area.

Interviewing was done by phone by the students enrolled in the course. Each interview took about 15 minutes to complete. A total of 100 respondents were interviewed. Three-fourths of the respondents were women, one fourth men. The questionnaire was coded into 126 items measuring the concepts elaborated above. Computation was done at the University of Maryland Computer Center with financial support from the Center.

Results

Several statistical manipulations were required before satisfactory consumer types could be obtained. The consumers sampled did not differ greatly in their responses to many of the questions in the interview schedule, and as a result two preliminary computer runs could not yield factors which could be interpreted. The first run, using intersection coefficients (which are simply the percentage of items which

each two people answer the same way) yielded only one factor on which the respondents loaded highest. This problem occurred because the responses to open-ended questions were coded as a series of binomial (0 or 1) categories. Respondents seldom mentioned more than one response per question and as a result a large percentage of the total responses were coded as 0. Thus, by default, most resondents correlated highly with one another (in the range of 60-70 percent of all variables), and only one factor could be extracted.

In the second run, standard Pearsonian correlation coefficients were substituted for intersection coefficients. This time, however, the rotation phase of the factor analysis was unsuccessful because the rotation procedure called for orthoganal (uncorrelated) factors, and independent types of consumers could not be derived from the data. Such a result seemed to call for an oblique rotation in which the factors or types are correlated or somewhat similar to each other. This third computer run, then, yielded three consumer types which could be used to successfully interpret the data. In this final run, however, 47 of the 126 items were shown to be "consensus variables" on which the consumer types did not differ. Such a result shows that all consumers had many responses in common, but it also helps us to isolate those variables which are most important in distinguishing consumer types.

Tables 1-3 show the order of importance of all 126 variables for each of the three types of consumers. These tables are most useful for getting a first picture of the type of consumer represented by each factor and for naming and making a preliminary description of each type. Then, item by item comparisons of the type can be made to get a more exact picture of the differences between the types.

Table 1 shows Type 1 to be characterized by, among other things, constraints in being able to choose a food store, not having heard of Giant's consumer programs, choosing general merchandise items on the basis of price, constrained decision in buying food items, unskilled and sometimes skilled labor occupations for husband and wife, older age, low income, low use of Giant consumer programs, infrequent giving of information about Giant programs, and low problem recognition in choice of a food store. Based on all of these variables, the best name for this type seems to be the Working Class Consumer.

Type 2 (see Table 2) is best distinguished by high education and professional occupation of husband and wife, relatively high income, use of Giant consumer programs, having heard of the Giant programs, relatively low scores on problem recognition in the choice of a food store and problem solving in making food purchases. An appropriate name for this type

seems to be the Professional Class Consumer.

For similar reasons, the third type (Table 3) can be called the Middle Class Consumer. The husband tends to have a skilled labor occupation, the wife a clerical or unskilled labor occupation. Both husband and wife are below average in education. But the type tends to hear about and use Giant consumer programs, tends to be a problem solver in choosing a food store, is the most frequent user of food advertisements, and is the most frequent Giant general merchandise shopper.

Since these factors were derived from an oblique (correlated) rotation, it is also useful to note that Types 2 and 3 had a correlation of -.37. Type 1 had substantially no correlation with the other types. Of the total sample of 100, 31 were placed in Type 1, 38 in Type 2, and 31 in Type 3. Although the sample is too small to extend these proportions to the entire consumer population in the Washington suburbs without encountering a large probability of error, we can say that the three types are distributed in roughly equal proportions. Type 1, however, tended to have a higher percentage of the respondents from the Baltimore area than of the respondents from the Washington area.

We then turn to Tables 4-22 for more specific comparisons of the three types. These tables contain the original scale and mean for each variable before the first Z-transformation

of the data. The means indicate the absolute averages for the entire sample on each variable. The tables also compare the three types on each variable--again expressed in Z-scores ranging from +3 to -3. These Z-scores indicate the relative importance of each variable in distinguishing each of the three types. The Z-scores can be compared both within and between types. However, when the original mean of the variable is skewed to either the high or low end of the range, the Z-scores must be interpreted with caution. When the original data are transformed to a Z-scale, an individual's score on a variable becomes his deviation from the average. When the average is low on the scale, any deviation above that average will be given a high Z-score. When the average is high, a deviation will yield a low Z-score. These biases will also be carried into the Z-scores reported in the tables in this report, particularly when there is very little difference on a variable between the three types. Thus; it is important to look at the original mean of each variable before interpreting the Z-scores in the tables.

Table 4 reports the demographic variables included in the study. These results clarify and support the names already given the three types. The working class is oldest, followed by the middle class. The husband tends to be a professional in the professional group, skilled laborer in

the middle class group, and unskilled laborer in the working class group. Forty-five percent of the wives are housewives in the entire population and there is little difference in this percentage for any type (Z-scores are all negative because of the bias discussed above). When the wife does work, however, she is most likely to have a professional job if she is in the professional group, followed by a managerial or clerical position. The middle class wife most likely has a clerical or unskilled labor position, the working class wife an unskilled labor or clerical position.

Education is highest for both husband and wife in the professional group, as is income. The middle class falls second in all of these categories, except that there is little difference in the education of the wife between the middle and working class typologies. There is little difference in sex of the respondent (three-fourths by design of the survey were female). There was also little difference between types in number living in the household and in the choice of Giant for food shopping.

Table 5 shows that the working class consumer is least likely to recognize a problem and most likely to face constraints (the constraint generally being lack of transportation). We could classify him as a fatalist--he shops at the nearest food store. The middle class (somewhat surprisingly) is most

likely to recognize a problem, least likely to face constraints. This type is relatively high on problem solving. The professional is slightly below average on problem recognition, above average on constraints. The type also lies somewhere between constrained decision and fatalism in the decision-situation model. In this case, lack of time probably constrained this family (wife most likely to work) to shopping at the nearest food store.

Table 6 indicates the problem orientation each type uses in choosing a food store--the most relevant attributes which each type uses in choosing such a store. For the entire sample, quality of products, price, and store characteristics are most frequently mentioned. Differences between types are not great, although as could be expected, the working class most often mentions price and location, the professional class service and courtesy, location, variety of products and quality of products. The middle class most often mentions quality of products and variety of products. Location, service, and store characteristics mean the least to this group.

Next, we asked the respondents how they choose particular food products once they are in a store. Responses were coded according to habit, constrained decision, fatalism and four types of problem solving orientations (Table 7). Habit as coded here included both routine habit (discussed above) and

intelligent habit, an aspect of problem solving in which decision rules are made and constantly evaluated and improved.

The working class was again most characterized by constrained decision, fatalism, and habit (presumably routine habit). It was below average on all problem-solving orientations. The professionals were highest on all types on habit (either routine or intelligent) but below average on all other decision types. Presumably, these consumers buy food in the same way each week, but based on our data we cannot say if this is routine or intelligent habit. However, Table 11 shows this type to be most likely to use a shopping list--also the response most likely to be coded "habit" (intelligent) for this type. The middle class was above average on both constrained decision and fatalism, but because of the low means for these two variables, the scores are somewhat suspect. Most important is the fact that this type is highest or second highest of all types on the problem solving orientations--whose means are also highest for the entire sample, thus depressing the Z-scores for these variables.

Table 8 confirms our diagnosis of the middle class as the most problem solving type in that it seeks information through food advertisements as the decision model would predict. The middle class is most likely to pay attention to food advertisements and to compare the ads of different stores.

The professionals are above average on both variables, the working class well below average on both.

The first of the communication network questions in the study asked respondents where they had first heard about Giant Food--responses which should indicate the most efficient channels by which Giant could reach potential customers of each type. Fifty-seven percent of the entire sample had first heard of Giant by observation, seeing the store in their neighborhood (Table 9). About 15 percent heard of the store by word-of mouth or from advertisements. Fourteen percent couldn't remember and only 3 percent heard of Giant through its direct mail campaign. Again, types did not differ much on this question. The only important differences were that the middle class group most likely heard of Giant from advertisements, least likely from observation--again reflecting this type's predisposition for information seeking. The working class group most likely heard of Giant from word-of-mouth or couldn't remember, the professionals most likely observed a Giant store.

Table 10 shows responses to a question asking who manufactures private label products in supermarkets. Since most such products are manufactured by brand companies, this question was expected to show possible misconceptions about private label products. The data first show that each type varies little from the average in using private label products, but that the working class is most likely of the three types to use the products. Seventy-two percent of the sample is correct in saying that a brand-name

company produces the product. Professionals are most likely to have this accurate information. The middle class, which would seem most likely to use these products because of its problem solving behavior and price orientation, is, however, least likely to know this fact and most likely not to know who manufactures the products and also most likely to believe the food chain manufactures them itself. Clearing up this misconception through advertising directed to the middle class would thus seem to be an important communication objective for Giant. (We will return to this problem later.)

Table 11, in presenting the last of the food store items, indicates that professionals are most likely to use a shopping list, while the other two types are slightly below average for this variable. But, again, none of the three types deviates much from the average for the variable. Fifty-eight percent of the sample reports that the wife alone does the food shopping. The wife is most likely, however, to do all of the shopping for the professionals. For the middle class, husband and wife also tend to shop together, while for the working class a single person shops (probably because of older age and higher probability of one partner being dead), although sometimes both shop together, the husband does the shopping, or both shop alone.

In Table 12, we see the responses to three questions about Giant's general merchandise stores. Since most of these stores are located with food stores in the same building or shopping center, we asked first if people shop for both food and general merchandise

at the same time (for all such stores, not just Giant). From the data, we can see that the middle class is very likely to do so, the professional group somewhat likely to do so, and the working class somewhat unlikely to do so. At the same time, the variable "general merchandise shopper" indicates that middle class consumers are well above average in frequency of shopping at Giant general merchandise stores, professionals somewhat below average, and working class people well below average.

The most frequent reason that was given for making the decision to shop or not to shop at a Giant general merchandise store was that the location was poor (the primary reason for not shopping there). This was most often mentioned by the working class and professionals, but was apparently unimportant for the middle class. The only other response to this question which characterized the working class was that Giant was not relevant i.e, that these respondents had nothing they needed to buy there. Profeesionals tended to mention negative attributes of the Giant stores--poor product quality, that they didn't like the concept of the store or that the service, courtesy, and conditions at the stores were poor. On the contrary, the middle class most often mentioned positive attributes of the general merchandise stores--good prices, good location, and good product quality. These results can be interpreted as a reflection of the middle-range qualty and price of Giant general merchandise. Such products satisfy the desires of the middle class, but are not perceived as good enough by the professional class.

Table 13 shows a series of responses to similar variables designed to measure consumer reaction to Giant's catalog showroom. Few of the respondents had ever used the showroom (only 14 percent had used them at all). Those who did use the showrooms came, however, most often from the professional group. All groups indicated the most frequent reasons for not using the showrooms to be poor location or that the showrooms were not relevant. The professionals also indicated that they preferred another showroom, the working class generally said they never heard of the showrooms. The only positive attribute mentioned by the professionals was location, but this was indicated by a relatively low z-score. Thus, all that we can say is that for some reason of which we are not aware, professionals are most likely to use Giant's and other catalog showrooms.

Table14 presents the results of the first of four questions dealing with consumer problem orientation to typical general merchandise products sold by Giant Stores. These questions were intended to uncover the kinds of consumer information which would be relevant to different types of consumers. For slacks-- a typical clothing item for both sexes--most consumers mentioned fit, quality, and appearance in that order. Professionals, however, mentioned appearance and quality still more often than the other types and were less likely to mention fit. The middle class and the working class more often mentioned ease of care, price, and brand.

For problem orientation when buying a toy (Table 15) the predominant response for all respondents was safety and durability. The middle class, however most often said durability, least often safety. The working class was also higher than the rest of the

sample in mentioning child or parent desire or price. Surprisingly, only 6 percent of the total sample mentioned the attribute "educational."

For sheets and towels (Table 16), 50 percent of the sample mentioned quality (fluffiness, thickness, etc.). But quality was most often mentioned by the professionals and by far the least often by the middle class. The middle class most often mentioned brand or ease-of-care. The working class and the professionals were also substantially more concerned with price than was the middle class.

In contrast to the above items, Table 17 shows that brand is the most frequent orientation in buying a television set (51 percent of the entire sample). Brand, however, was most often cited by the middle class, least often by the professionals. Professionals were also concerned with appearance, price, warrenty, service, and quality. The working class was primarily concerned with price.

At this point in the interview, we turned to a series of questions dealing with Giant's consumer information programs. Table 18 shows whether the consumers interviewed had heard about four programs--unit pricing, open dating, nutritional labeling, and percentage labeling--and where they had heard about the programs. The table shows that working class respondents most often had not heard of the programs, professionals had heard of them from in-store displays, radio and televisions, newspapers, or other people. Middle class respondents most often heard of the programs on radio

and television. Seldom did the middle class type hear about the programs in newspapers, showing that although this group reads newspaper food ads, it apparently does not read Giant's consumer information ads.

Table 19 then shows which groups use these four consumer programs. As could be expected, the working class seldom uses any of the programs. Open dating is the most frequently used by the entire sample and by the professionals and middle class in particular. The professionals are slightly below average in using nutritional labeling and percentage labeling, the middle class slightly above average. The professionals are fairly well above average in using unit pricing, the middle class only slightly above. The middle class apparently does not see unit pricing as an important aid to its problem solving food buying--probably because it relies more on comparison shopping of "specials" advertised in newspapers.

Table 20 shows the responses to a similar communication network question about the toy information guide announced by Giant the week before the survey. In this case, 80 percent of the sample had not heard of the guide, but the middle class was most likely to have heard of it, the working class least likely. Those who heard of it most likely did so on radio and television (two Washington stations had filmed the press conference announcing the program). The middle class was most likely to hear of the program this way, however, and was also somewhat more likely to have heard about it in a Giant store. Finally, only

the middle class typology said it would use the toy guide. Apparently, only regular Giant middle-class customers heard about the program and intended to pick up a copy of the guide when they went to a Giant store. Others would not make a special trip for it.

In Table 21, we can see the results of the coorientational questions asked of respondents--basically why they think Giant was carrying out its programs. First, we see that about 50 percent of all respondents think Giant began its consumer program to increase profits and sales and to attract customers. Fifty percent also said Giant began the program to keep consumers informed. Twenty-one percent believed Giant was forced to begin the program because of competition or other external pressure. There was no significant difference between the types on these variables. Nearly all respondents also said Giant was more concerned about consumers than were other food chains. Also, nearly all said Giant was aware of consumer opinion; middle class and professional respondents were particularly likely to say Giant was aware. Finally, only middle class consumers said they had given information on Giant consumer programs to other people.

In the final question, we simply asked respondents what the name Esther Peterson meant to them (Table 22). Respondents generally knew either that she was with Giant or didn't know who she was. Middle class people were most likely to know she was with Giant, working class not to know who she was. The professioals were above average in identifying her with Giant, but were also

above average in identifying her as just a consumer advocate or in identifying her with Giant in a derogatory vein.

Interpretation and Implications

Taken all together, these results show that Giant's consumer information program has been very successful in earning good will among its customers. Although many customers believe Giant began the program to attract customers and increase its profits, just as many believe Giant's purpose was simply to help keep its customers informed. Consumers also believe Giant is more concerned about them than are most food chains and that Giant is aware of their opinions. The middle class and professional types also know who Giant's consumer adviser is, know of the consumer programs, and tend to use them.

The first and most obvious communication problem is that represented by the working class customers. Because of both situational constraints and lack of problem perception, most of them shop at only one store and think little about the products they buy. The type is basically fatalistic about its food purchases, and there is little Giant can do to communicate consumer information to this type.

Professionals use Giant consumer programs--particularly open dating--but they are not generally problem solvers when buying food. They buy most food out of habit and are constrained by time or other limitations to using one food store. If they are regular Giant customers, they use and appreciate the consumer programs. If they are not regular customers, they do not use them.

The middle class customers make up the type most responsive to communications. They generally have the time and transportation needed to shop at several stores, and they read food ads and compare specials from different stores. They make food decisions from a price or brand orientation, but do not use unit pricing significantly above average. In short, they want to make large price comparisons, not small ones. Again, they have heard of the consumer program and appreciate it (particularly open dating and percentage labeling), but none of the programs really stress attributes relevant to their problem orientation.

An important problem with regard to this middle class group, however, is that it does not understand nor greatly utilize the Giant private label products. This finding perhaps also explains why this group does not use unit pricing more. Unit pricing basically tells a customer that private label products are less expensive, but this group apparently buys name brands and believes private label products are inferior. Thus, unit pricing would have little relevance to them.

The study also clearly shows that Giant's general merchandise stores appeal primarily to the middle class. This group apparently chose Giant because it likes the prices offered at Giant stores, as indicated by the type's overall reason for shopping there and its orientation to specific products. It shops at Giant because it likes the product quality and prices. In slacks, the type looks for ease-of-care and price. These middle class consumers also look for ease-of-care in buying sheets and towels, brand and appearance of a television set, and durability of toys.

Goods offered at Giant stores generally satisfy these orientations. Professionals, however, dislike Giant general merchandise stores for the same reasons. Their orientations are to quality, appearance and service, and in these they seem to find Giant lacking. The working class does not use Giant general merchandise stores because they cannot reach them or do not find them relevant to their needs. The working class orientation for specific goods is price, and apparently many Giant goods are too expensive for them.

Since general merchandise customers come mostly from the middle class, general merchandise information programs should be directed toward this group (unless the nature of the stores is to be radically altered). Information on the ease-of-care and price of clothing and household items and durability of toys would be most relevant for this group. For appliances, most middle class customers simply want to know whether brand names are available at favorable prices.

Finally, the study may have revealed new information about the background of catalog shoppers. Since only a few respondents in the sample used the catalog showrooms, we must interpret these results with great caution. Nevertheless, the catalog merchandising program seems to appeal most to professionals because catalog showrooms save scarce time which they cannot spend in department stores.

From the standpoint of corporate communication in general, the study has supported the utility of the theories applied--particularly the decision model and network theory--in that they

have made it possible to isolate and understand the communication and decision behavior of different consumer types. Although the three types found in this study may be unique to this one company, the theory and method have been shown to be relevant in this case and should also be relevant to many different kinds of organizations and situations. In particular, the study has shown that it is possible for an organization to seek information from its publics and to understand the behavior and information needs of those publics.

FOOTNOTES

1. Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, Effective Public Relations, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 11.

2. Edward J. Robinson, Communication and Public Relations (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966), p.51.

3. James E. Grunig, An Organizational Theory of Public Relations, monograph in preparation.

4. James E. Grunig, Shirley Al Doory, Fred Jacoby, Marie Mastin, and Harriet Rothenberg, "Report to the Potomac Electric Power Company on Employee Orientations and Communications, University of Maryland, 1973.

5. James E. Grunig, "A Decision-Situation Model of Communication Behavior," Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism, Fort Collins, Colo., August 1973.

6. Chaffee has found information seeking to be highest when a message contained an attribute which distinguished among alternatives. Steven H. Chaffee, "Conflict, Information-Seeking and the Discriminating Attribute," Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalsim, Boulder, Colo., August 1968.

7. For a duscussion of network analysis, see Richard V. Farace and James A. Danowski, "Analyzing Human Communication Networks in Organizations," Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Montreal, April 1973.

8. See the entire issue of American Behavioral Scientist, March/April 1973 for an up-to-date review of this research.

9. See Malcolm S. MacLean, Jr., "Some Multivariate Designs for Communications Research," Journalism Quarterly 42 (1965), pp. 614-622; William Stephenson, The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp.47-61.

Table 1: Relative Importance of 126 Items in Defining Consumer Type 1, The Working Class.

Item Name	Z-Score[1]
Food store constraints	2.80
Consumer program network--not heard	2.72
TV orientation--price	2.04
Sheet-towel orientation--price	1.84
General merchandise decision--location, negative	1.79
Shopping done by single	1.69
Toy orientation--child or parent desire	1.64
Catalog decision--never heard of it	1.59
Private label manufacturer is food chain	1.43
Wife's occupation--skilled laborer	1.35
Food decision--constrained decision	1.24
Toy orientation--price	1.23
Husband's occupation--skilled laborer	1.23
General merchandise decision--Giant not relevant	1.09
Giant consumer program motivation--competition or pressure	1.06
Age	.95
Consumer adviser--doesn't know	.94
Shopping done by both together	.93
Slacks orientation--appearance	.92
Heard of Giant by word-of-mouth	.89
Toy orientation--educational	.87
Heard of Giant--doesn't remember	.83
Toy orientation--doesn't buy	.83
Consumer adviser--mentions with Giant unfavorably	.75
Slacks orientation--price	.71
Sheet-towel orientation--ease of care	.68
Private label use	.67
Catalog decision--price, negative	.65
Shopping done by husband	.62
Consumer program information network--other	.62
Consumer adviser--knows as consumer advocate	.60
Shopping done by both alone	.57
Private label manufacturer--doesn't know	.53
Slacks orientation--ease of care	.52
Husband's occupation--clerical	.49
Wife's occupation--clerical	.48
Store attributes--price	.48
General merchandise decision--attached to other store	.48
Toy orientation--suitability to child	.43
Wife's occupation--professional	.43
Store attributes--location, convenience	.41
Television orientation--service	.39
Heard of Giant by advertisements	.37
Slacks orientation--brand	.36
Heard of Giant by observation	.36
Toy program information network--other	.35
Sheet-towel orientation--appearance	.33
Food decision--habit	.32

[1]In a normal distribution, 68% of all items in this and following tables should fall between +1 and -1, 95% between +2 and -2, 99% between +3 and -3.

Table 1 (continued)

Toy program information network--radio-TV	.32
Private label manufacturer is lower grade product or company	.29
Food decision--fatalism	.28
Catalog decision--location, positive	.28
Catalog decision--price, positive	.26
Toy orientation--brand	.22
General merchandise decision--doesn't like concept	.22
General merchandise decision--location, positive	.21
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, positive	.21
Television orientation--appearance	.21
Sheet-towel orientation--brand	.18
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, negative	.18
Consumer program information network--other people	.11
Private label manufacturer is brand-name company	.07
Store choice (Giant high)	.06
Catalog shopper	.06
Slacks orientation--fit	.01
Catalog decision--product quality, positive	.00
General merchandise decision--product quality, positive	.00
Heard of Giant by direct mail	.00
General merchandise decision--price, positive	.00
General merchandise decision--price, negative	.00
Television orientation--warrenty	.00
Catalog decision--prefer other showroom	.00
Catalog decision--product quality, negative	.00
Toy program information network--newspaper	.00
Toy program information network--other people	.00
Toy program information network--in store	.00
General merchandise decision--product quality, negative	.00
Wife's occupation--managerial	.00
Wife's occupation--unskilled labor	.00
Television orientation--brand	- .06
Giant consumer program motivation--profits, sales, attract customers	- .06
Catalog decision--location, negative	- .16
Shopping list frequency	- .19
Food decision--problem solving, no orientation	- .21
Wife's education	- .22
Sheet-towel orientation--quality	- .23
Toy orientation--safety	- .27
Giant consumer program motivation--keep customers informed	- .28
Slacks orientation--quality	- .32
Toy program information network--not heard	- .34
Joint food-general merchandise shopping	- .37
Food decision--problem solving, price orientation	- .43
Husband's occupation--skilled laborer	- .46
Perceived Giant opinion awareness	- .56
Wife's occupation--housewife	- .66
Food advertisement attention	- .68
Shopping done by wife	- .73

Table 2: Relative Importance of 126 Items in Defining Consumer Type 2, The Professional Class.

Item	Z-Score
Husband's education	2.85
Husband's occupation--professional	2.63
Consumer adviser--knows as consumer advocate	2.47
Wife's education	1.64
Use open dating	1.62
Slacks orientation--appearance	1.52
Wife's occupation--professional	1.48
Catalog shopper	1.29
Consumer adviser--mentions with Giant unfavorably	1.27
Food decision--habit	1.14
Sheet-towel orientation--price	1.10
Private label manufacturer is brand-name company	1.04
Catalog decision--prefer other showroom	1.04
Private label manufacturer is lower grade product or company	1.02
Consumer program information network--in store	.96
General merchandise decision--product quality, negative	.92
Income	.92
Food advertisement comparison	.90
Perceived Giant opinion awareness	.89
Shopping done by wife	.87
Television orientation--appearance	.87
Heard of Giant by observation	.85
Toy orientation--suitability to child	.84
Toy orientation--educational	.82
Wife's occupation--managerial	.80
Television orientation--price	.78
Husband's occupation--clerical	.77
Sheet-towel orientation--appearance	.73
Sheet-towel orientation--ease of care	.72
Toy orientation--child or parent desire	.71
Toy orientation--price	.66
General merchandise decision--doesn't like concept	.66
Use unit pricing	.65
Catalog decision--location, positive	.64
Joint food-general merchandise chopping	.62
Television orientation--warrenty	.61
Television orientation--service	.60
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, negative	.58
Giant consumer program motivation--competition or pressure	.57
Sheet-towel orientation--quality	.55
Food store constraints	.54
Wife's occupation--clerical	.52
Consumer program information network--radio-TV	.51
Shopping done by both together	.50
General merchandise decision--location, positive	.47
General merchandise decision--product quality, positive	.37
Heard of Giant by word-of-mouth	.36
Toy program information network--radio-TV	.36
Slacks orientation--price	.34
Catalog decision--never heard of it	.32
Shopping list frequency	.28

Table 2 (continued)

General merchandise decision--attached to other store	.19
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, positive	.14
Food advertisement attention	.14
Consume program information network--other people	.10
Consume adviser--knows with Giant	.10
Consumer program information network--newspaper	.10
Sheet-towel orientation--brand	.08
Slacks orientation--quality	.06
General merchandise decision--price, positive	.05
Heard of Giant--doesn't remember	.04
Private label manufacturer--doesn't know	.03
Slacks orientation--brand	.03
Giant consumer program motivation--profits, sales, attract customers	.01
Toy orientation--brand	- .01
Food decision--fatalism	- .02
Catalog decision--price, negative	- .03
Heard of Giant by advertisements	- .05
Shopping done by husband	- .05
Shopping done by single	- .06
Toy program information network--other	- .07
Use nutritional labeling	- .10
Slacks orientation--ease of care	- .14
General merchandise shopper	- .17
Shopping done by both alone	- .18
Toy orientation--doesn't buy	- .19
General merchandise decision--location, negative	- .22
Food decision--constrained decision	- .25
Consumer program network--other	- .25
Store choice (Giant high)	- .31
Toy orientation--safety	- .33
Evaluation of Giant consumer concern	- .38
Catalog decision--price, positive	- .41
Toy program information network--newspaper	- .41
Toy program information network--other people	- .41
Toy program information network--in store	- .41
Catalog decision--product quality, negative	- .41
Heard of Giant by direct mail	- .41
Catalog decision--product quality, positive	- .41
Private label manufacturer is food chain	- .41
Husband's occupation--unskilled labor	- .41
General merchandise decision--Giant not relevant	- .41
General merchandise decision--price, negative	- .41
Wife's occupation--skilled labor	- .41
Wife's occupation--unskilled labor	- .41
Age	- .42
Giant consumer program motivation--keep consumers informed	- .42
Private label use	- .43
Food decision--problem solving, brand orientation	- .45
Food store problem recognition	- .51

Table 2 (continued)

Store attributes--service, courtesy	- .52
Use percentage labeling	- .63
Store attributes--quality of products	- .67
Store attributes--variety of products	- .67
Store attributes--location, convenience	-..68
Television orientation--quality	- .76
Slacks orientation--fit	- .87
Wife's occupation--housewife	- .95
Number in household	- .96
Toy program information network--not heard	-1.06
Catalog decision--location, negative	-1.10
Will use toy guide	-1.15
Catalog decision--not relevant	-1.24
Sex (female high)	-1.32
Gives information on Giant programs	-1.44
Toy orientation--durability	-1.45
Store attributes--store characteristics	-1.52
Television orientation--brand	-1.66
Food decision--problem solving, price orientation	-1.85
Consumer program information network--not heard	-1.87
Store attributes--price	-1.90
Husband's occupation--managerial	-2.00
Food decision--problem solving, quality orientation	-2.01
Food decision--problem solving, no orientation	-2.49
Consumer adviser--doesn't know	-2.77
Husband's occupation--skilled labor	-3.34

Table 3: Relative Importance of 126 Items in Defining Consumer Type 3, The Middle Class

Item	Z-Score
General merchandise decision--price, positive	2.46
Husband's occupation--skilled labor	2.31
Joint food, general merchandise shopping	2.26
Heard of Giant by advertisements	2.05
Sheet-towel orientation--brand	1.97
Perceived Giant opinion awareness	1.81
Private label manufacturer is food chain	1.76
Toy program information network--radio-TV	1.58
Wife's occupation--clerical	1.54
General merchandise decision--location, positive	1.30
General merchandise decision--product quality, positive	1.29
Slacks orientation--ease of care	1.23
Giant consumer program motivation--competition or pressure	1.20
Private label manufacturer--doesn't know	1.18
Use open dating	1.09
Television orientation--brand	1.02
Food advertisement comparison	1.00
General merchandise shopper	.92
Toy program information network--newspaper	.92
Wife's occupation--unskilled labor	.91
Heard of Giant by direct mail	.89
Consumer adviser--knows with Giant	.89
Shopping done by both together	.88
Toy program information network--in store	.87
Sheet-towel orientation--ease of care	.87
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, positive	.83
General merchandise decision--price, negative	.76
Food decision--constrained decision	.68
Use percentage labeling	.65
Toy orientation--brand	.65
Heard of Giant by word-of-mouth	.65
Food advertisement attention	.56
Television orientation--appearance	.54
Food store problem recognition	.52
Slacks orientation--price	.52
Gives information on Giant programs	.51
Will use toy guide	.46
Catalog decision--price, negative	.43
Food decision, fatalism	.42
Shopping done by wife	.41
Slacks orientation--brand	.41
General merchandise decision--service, courtesy, conditions, negative	.36
Use nutritional labeling	.34
Use unit pricing	.33
Catalog decision--never heard of it	.32

Table 3 (continued)

Wife's education	- .52
Store attributes--variety of products	- .54
Giant consumer program motivation--profits, sales, attract customers	- .55
Income	- .57
Slacks orientation--quality	- .58
Store choice (Giant high)	- .62
Husband's education	- .66
Shopping list frequency	- .68
Food decision--problem solving, brand orientation	- .75
Store attributes--price	- .83
Giant consumer program motivation--keep consumers informed	- .88
Sex (female high)	- .91
Number in household	- .93
Consumer program information network--newspapers	- .97
Store attributes--store characteristics	- .99
Private label manufacturer is brand name company	-1.06
Heard of Giant by observation	-1.12
Catalog decision--location, negative	-1.20
Catalog decision--not relevant	-1.32
Consumer program information network--not heard	-1.32
Toy orientation--safety	-1.41
Sheet-towel orientation--quality	-1.60
Husband's occupation--managerial	-1.63
Store attributes--service, courtesy	-1.72
Consumer adviser--doesn't know	-1.87
Television orientation--quality	-1.90
General merchandise decision--location, negative	-1.99
Store attributes--location, convenience	-2.03
Toy program network--not heard	-2.64
Food decision--habit	-2.76
Husband's occupation--professional	-2.81

Table 4: Average Scores of Consumer Sample on Locator Variables and Relative Importance of These Variables in Defining Consumer Types

Variable	Scale	Mean[1]	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
			(Z-Scores)		
Age	1-5	2.66	1.0	- .4	.3
Number in household	1-	3.62	- .8	-1.0	- .9
Husband's occupation-					
professional	0-1	.27	-1.5	2.6	-2.8
managerial	0-1	.21	-1.5	-2.0	-1.6
clerical	0-1	.09	.5	.8	.1
skilled laborer	0-1	.27	- .5	-3.3	2.3
unskilled laborer	0-1	.06	1.2	- .4	- .0
Wife's occupation--					
professional	0-1	.15	.4	1.5	- .3
managerial	0-1	.04	.0	.8	- .1
clerical	0-1	.19	.5	.5	1.5
skilled laborer	0-1	.03	1.4	- .4	- .4
unskilled laborer	0-1	.04	.0	- .4	.9
housewife	0-1	.45	- .7	- .9	- .4
Husband's education	1-5	2.70	-1.3	2.9	- .7
Wife's education	1-5	2.62	- .2	1.6	- .5
Income	1-5	3.41	-1.8	.9	- .6
Sex of respondent (female high)	1-2	1.84	-1.1	-1.3	- .9
Store choice (Giant high)	1-3	2.03	.1	- .3	- .6

[1] Expressed in this and following tables as the average score of all respondents on scale used for each variable.

Table 5: Average Scores of Consumer Sample on Decision Model Variables and Relative Importance of These Variables in Defining Consumer Types

Variable	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
			(Z-Scores)		
Food store problem recognition	1-3	2.15	-1.5	- .5	.5
Food store constraints	0-1	.13	2.8	.5	- .2

Table 6: Attributes Perceived as Most Relevant for a Food Store, Entire Sample and by Types

Attribute	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Location and convenience	.27	.4	- .7	-2.0
Service and courtesy	.22	-1.5	- .5	-1.7
Store characteristics	.36	- .8	-1.5	-1.0
Variety of products	.29	-1.6	- .7	- .5
Price	.42	.5	-1.9	- .8
Quality of products	.45	- .7	- .7	.1

Table 7: Decision Modes Used to Purchase Food Products in a Store, Entire Sample and by Types

Mode	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Habit (intelligent or routine)	.27	.3	1.1	-2.8
Constrained decision	.07	1.2	- .2	.7
Fatalism	.04	.3	- .0	.4
Problem solving--				
no orientation	.26	- .2	-2.5	- .4
price orientation	.43	- .4	-1.9	.0
quality orientation	.21	-1.6	-2.0	- .1
brand orientation	.28	-1.2	- .5	- .8

Table 8: Use and Comparison of Newspaper Food Advertisements by Entire Sample and by Types

	Mean (Scale, 1-3)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Food advertisement attention	2.09	- .7	.1	.6
Food advertisement comparison	2.19	-1.0	.9	1.0

Table 9: How Entire Sample and Types First Heard of Giant

Heard of Giant by:	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Observation	.57	.4	.8	-1.1
Word-of-mouth	.15	.9	.4	.6
Advertisements	.12	.4	.0	2.0
Direct mail	.03	.0	- .4	.9
Doesn't remember	.14	.8	.0	.3

Table 10: Use of Supermarket Private Label Products and Perceived Manufacturer of These Products, Entire Sample and Types

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Private label use	1-3	2.23	.7	- .4	- .3
Private label manufacturer is:					
Brand name company	0-1	.72	.1	1.0	-1.1
Lower grade product or company	0-1	.09	.3	1.0	- .1
Food chain	0-1	.13	1.4	- .4	1.8
Doesn't know	0-1	.11	.5	.0	.2

Table 11: How Shopping is Done by Entire Sample and by Types

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Profes- ionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Shopping list frequency	1-3	2.29	- .2	.3	- .7
Shopping done by single	0-1	.15	1.7	- .1	.0
Shopping done by wife	0-1	.58	- .7	.9	.4
Shopping done by husband	0-1	.03	.6	- .0	- .4
Shopping done by both together	0-1	.19	.9	.5	.9
Shopping done by both alone	0-1	.10	.5	- .2	.1

Table 12: Extent of General Merchandise Shopping and Attributes Cited as Reason for Decision, Entire Sample and Types

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Profes- ionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Joint food-general merchandise shopping	1-4	2.39	- .4	.6	2.3
General merchandise shopper	1-3	2.00	-1.4	- .2	.9
General merchandise decision:					
Location, positive	0-1	.10	.2	.5	1.3
Location, negative	0-1	.53	1.8	1 .2	-2.0
Product quality, positive	0-1	.10	.0	.4	1.3
Product quality, negative	0-1	.05	.0	.9	- .4
Price, positive	0-1	.12	.0	.0	2.5
Price, negative	0-1	.03	.0	- .4	.8
Service, courtesy, conditions, positive	0-1	.09	.2	.1	.8
Service, courtesy, conditions, negative	0-1	.09	.2	.6	.4
Doesn't like concept	0-1	.09	.2	.7	.1
Attached to other store	0-1	.05	.5	.2	.1
Giant not relevant	0-1	.03	1.1	- .4	- .4

Table 13: Extent of Catalog Shopping and Attributes Cited as Reason for Decision, Entire Sample and Types

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Profes- sionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Catalog shopper	1-3	1.16	.1	1.3	.2
Catalog decision:					
Location, positive	0-1	.03	.3	.6	- .4
Location, negative	0-1	.38	- .2	-1.1	-1.2
Product quality, positive	0-1	.00	.0	- .4	- .4
Product quality, negative	0-1	.00	.0	- .4	- .4
Price, positive	0-1	.02	.3	- .4	.1
Price, negative	0-1	.05	.6	- .0	.4
Prefer other showroom	0-1	.08	.0	1.0	- .4
Never heard of it	0-1	.12	1.6	.3	.3
Not relevant	0-1	.35	-1.0	-1.2	-1.3

Table 14: Problem Orientation in Buying Slacks, Entire Sample and Types

Orientation	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Fit	.50	.0	- .9	- .5
Quality	.46	- .3	.1	- .6
Ease of care	.06	.5	- .1	1.2
Appearance	.20	.9	1.5	- .0
Price	.10	.7	.3	.5
Brand	.04	.4	.0	.4

Table 15: Problem Orientation in Buying a Toy, Entire Sample and Types

Orientation	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Safety	.42	- .3	- .3	-1.4
Durability	.37	-1.6	-1.4	.2
Price	.07	1.2	.7	.3
Suitability to child	.09	.4	.8	- .1
Child or parent desire	.18	1.6	.7	.1
Brand	.06	.2	.0	.7
Educational	.06	.9	.8	- .4
Doesn't buy	.08	.8	- .2	.3

Table 16: Problem Orientation in Buying Sheets or Towels, Entire Sample and Types

Orientation	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Quality	.50	- .2	.6	-1.6
Ease of care	.18	.7	.7	.9
Appearance	.15	.3	.7	.1
Price	.20	1.9	1.1	- .2
Brand	.16	.2	.1	2.0

Table 17: Problem Orientation in Buying a Television Set, Entire Sample and Types

Orientation	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Brand	.51	- .1	-1.7	1.0
Service	.06	.4	.6	- .4
Quality	.33	-1.1	- .8	-1.9
Warrenty	.05	.0	.6	.3
Appearance	.10	.2	.9	.5
Price	.23	2.0	.8	.2

Table 18: Consumer Program Information Network: How Entire Sample and Types Heard of Four Giant Consumer Programs

Heard from:	Mean (Scale, 0-4)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Not heard	1.19	2.7	-1.9	-1.3
Radio-television	1.15	-1.5	.5	.2
Newspaper	.81	-1.8	.1	-1.0
Other people	.05	.1	.1	.0
In store	1.05	-1.1	1.0	- .3
Other	.06	.6	- .3	- .3

Table 19: Extent to Which Entire Sample and Types Use Four Giant Consumer Programs

Program	Mean (Scale, 1-3)	Working Class	Profes-sionals	Middle Class
		(Z-scores)		
Unit pricing	2.09	-1.8	.7	.3
Open dating	2.32	-1.6	1.6	1.1
Nutritional labeling	1.85	-2.0	- .1	.3
Percentage labeling	1.66	-2.3	- .6	.7

Table 20: Toy Program Information Network: How Entire Sample Heard About Giant Toy Information Guide, and Planned Use of Guide

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Heard from:					
Not heard	0-1	.80	- .3	-1.1	-2.6
Radio-television	0-1	.12	.3	.4	1.6
Newspaper	0-1	.03	.0	- .4	.9
Other people	0-1	.00	.0	- .4	- .4
In store	0-1	.03	.0	- .4	.9
Other	0-1	.02	.4	- .1	- .4
Will use toy guide	1-3	1.84	-1.3	-1.1	.5

Table 21: Perceived Motivation for Consumer Program, Evaluation of Giant Consumer Concern, and Extent of Giving Information About Giant Programs, Entire Sample and Types

	Scale	Mean	Working Class	Professionals	Middle Class
			(Z-scores)		
Perceived Giant motivation:					
Profits, sales, attract customers	0-1	.51	- .1	.0	- .6
Keep consumers informed	0-1	.48	- .3	- .4	- .9
Competition or pressure	0-1	.22	1.1	.6	1.2
Evaluation of Giant consumer concern	1-3	2.45	- .9	- .4	- .4
Gives information on Giant programs	1-3	1.34	-2.2	-1.4	.5
Perceived Giant opinion awareness	1-3	2.65	- .6	.9	1.8

Table 22: Responses to Question, "Who is Esther Peterson," Entire Sample and Types

	Mean (Scale, 0-1)	Working Class	Professionals	Working Class
		(Z-scores)		
Knows with Giant	.47	-1.9	.1	.9
Mentions with Giant unfavorably	.12	.8	1.3	.1
Knows as consumer advocate	.12	.6	2.5	- .4
Doesn't know	.35	.9	-2.8	-1.9